

twice the level of inflation, we could take care of every senior citizen and balance that budget, and that is not too much to ask. Is the gentleman aware that he made that statement?

Mr. NEUMANN. Yes, and I have heard so many times in our town hall meetings, people in Wisconsin are saying, "Why are you increasing it at twice the rate of inflation?"

Mr. GRAHAM. Is it not a fact that we are increasing it twice the rate of inflation?

Mr. NEUMANN. Yes, it is.

Mr. GRAHAM. What he said to do; what Mrs. Clinton said to do. We are doing what they asked or told somebody to do 2 years ago, and we are getting killed for it by them.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], was this the President's first try at balancing the budget? Which budget number is this as far as the \$115 billion figure?

Mr. NEUMANN. This is budget No. 3. But in all fairness, I will point out that this is, in fact, the closest we have been to a legitimate budget proposal. This is the closest that he has been in three tries to balance the budget.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. The first budget wound up in the Senate with a 99-to-nothing vote.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was 96.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I have to wrap up my part of this. Can I conclude very briefly here? This Nation of ours, this great country our ours, is in trouble. We are \$5 trillion in debt. We are sinking fast. We have got deficits every year through the year 2002.

Every time this Nation has been in trouble in the past, do my colleagues know what has happened? The American people have joined together and solved the problems. Not Democrats, not Republicans; Americans.

It is time for us, the Members of this Congress and the President of the United States, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as Americans first, to get the job done that American people sent us here to do and to get the job done that we promised we would do on their behalf when we came here.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin very much for bringing this information. I want to say briefly that our priorities in this process in defending, to a degree, the increase in the debt even under our plan, is that we are committed right now with priorities of a 7-year balanced budget; the second being CBO scoring, which we are still working on; the third being the quick elimination of the deficit and the debt.

Unfortunately, under our plan, while we are working at eliminating the deficit, we are unfortunately still adding to the debt. But after that deficit is gone, then the debt gets worked down.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, and I thank our good friend from Wisconsin who once again demonstrates why he has been the workhorse of the

budget process and is deserving every accolade that this new Congress can provide.

I am holding here a certain financial document. It is a check. I heard my friend from Nebraska and my good friend from South Carolina lament the fact that the President of the United States was making allegations about Medicare that is part of the cacophony, the mantra of the medicare campaign of the discredited American liberals who cannot seem to face facts. So, how ironic it would be if this President, who has worked very hard with his own special interests to raise scads of money for what will be a very difficult reelection campaign, again, Mr. Speaker, the challenge goes out to everyone, including the President of the United States, if they can show us a cut in Medicare spending that goes from \$4,800 this year now to \$7,100 per beneficiary in the year 2002, if there is some way to do that, then the Republican National Committee, Haley Barbour, the national chairman, is prepared to pay up with \$1 million.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Would the gentleman yield on that point? Your seniors in Arizona will not be herded into just one program, will they? They will have an opportunity for a number of choices.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And freedom of choice is one of the fascinating things about Medicare-Plus. And just as the benefits per beneficiary increase, so do the opportunities and options for seniors under Medicare-Plus.

Speaking of opportunities and options, as I reclaim the time, let me also turn to our good friend from Kansas who has a couple of housekeeping items which we need to allow him to take care of, but also may have some observations. Let me yield time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Arizona yielding to me. This \$1 million check, I think, is a clear statement to the American people, to anybody anywhere in the world, that if there is a real cut in Medicare, show us. We will pay them \$1 million.

The point of it is, and it is just to make a point, there are no cuts in Medicare. I appreciate my colleagues explaining that to this body, so that this body can understand, as I think most of them do, but in some cases act like they do not, what the situation really is.

I particularly appreciate the earlier dialog that I have been watching as well, saying to this body and educating this body, look, we are in a dire situation. We have got to do that and we have got to do that compassionately and we are doing it compassionately.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2644

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name

be withdrawn as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 2644.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back to my good colleague, who is educating this body about the perils that we are really in and what we can do to help this and make the future for our children better.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Kansas and I would invite him to join us here in this historic Chamber to discuss issues of historic import as we are transforming this government, not by reinventing it, but by remembering what works; remembering that document from which all of this flows, that remarkable document called the Constitution, and remembering this fundamental premise: That when people are allowed to keep more of what they earn, the fruits of their honest labor, and save, spend, and invest it according to the dictates of their conscience and their priority, there is nothing selfish about that.

I am sure what prompted my friend to come to the floor was the evaluation of our colleague from Nebraska, who has spent countless hours on the Ways and Means Committee drafting tax reform and reduction policy, who informed us earlier that less than 2 percent of this vast array of money we are talking about, less than 2 percent in the grand scheme of things is used for tax cuts.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think it is a tremendous point and that that needs to be driven home to this body even more. Right now, the Federal Government, and this is a massive amount, it is hard to understand, takes 22 percent of the U.S. economy. It is the Federal Government. This huge piece, 22 percent.

Now, the gentleman from Arizona I am sure probably knows this figure, but in 1950 does the gentleman know what percent of the U.S. Government was of the Federal economy?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I know the gentleman from Kansas will inform us all.

Mr. BROWNBACK. It was about 4 percent. Can the gentleman imagine what the liberation would be of this Nation, of the people here, if the Federal Government, instead of 22 percent, was just 4 percent? Or, what if we got from 22 percent to 15 percent? There would be a blossoming across America of growth, of productivity, of jobs, of opportunities, of people going forward themselves and saying, "My goodness, why were we carrying such a heavy load?"

The next number of years, what has to take place in this country is we have to shrink the public sector, because the private sector is tired of carrying it and cannot carry it any further. That is what we are trying to do. It is not Draconian; it is very compassionate to help people.

This could be one of the greatest Christmas gifts that we could give the American people, my children, and our future grandchildren, and the children of the gentleman from Arizona, to get this down so that they can be liberated and free.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas, because he makes an incredibly valid point that really should be the foundation of our labors in the days to come. As the controversy continues to surround this new direction in which we are heading, returning to those values which made us great, it is worth noting that in the spirit of the season, the greatest gift we can give to our children, we can give to our grandparents, we can give to our parents, and we can give to generations yet unborn, is a stable environment in which this constitutional Republic can flourish, and individual initiative can be rewarded.

So, that is the challenge and that is the great gift and the great opportunity that we trust our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us in giving the American people this season of the year.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield just a moment, because the gentleman from Arizona has been deeply involved in, and started, what has been called the Constitutional Caucus. I would ask the gentleman if the Founding Fathers were alive today, does the gentleman think they would find that we have a constitutional government existing and operating in Washington?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming the time, I thank the gentleman for the question. I think they would find a government that has become a hybrid, and I do not mean that in a good sense. I know the gentleman has great background in agriculture. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say a mutant, constitutionally mutated from this document here, which is our cornerstone, read and reshaped and stretched oftentimes beyond recognition from its original intent to fit the explosive growth of an evermore centralized bureaucracy, a bureaucracy that spends even more.

So, we have stretched it out. It is our mission, and that is why I am so glad to have our colleague from Kansas to join in restoring constitutional government, recognizing the legislative branch has every bit the role of self-examination and introspection that the judicial branch is afforded through the notion of judicial review, that the executive branch uses, that we together, with those other two branches, can restore constitutional government. That is exactly the challenge to use this timeless document as we confront the next century.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I think it also ties into this overall issue of the budget debate. If we would get back to what the Founding Fathers had envisioned of a limited Federal Government and saying this is a limited government of lim-

ited powers, the Federal Government would not be 22 percent of the economy. It would not be the burden that it is today. We would not have as much centralization; we would have much more decentralization and things out amongst the people where they could control them closer to home and closer to them.

That was the original design, and I think we have gotten away from that to our peril. The gentleman has a particularly good effort going on, that before any bill is introduced, before it is taken up on the floor, that the constitutional basis for that bill would be discussed.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming the time, and the purposes to which we must reaffirm ourselves, to which we must devote our attentions, for just as we take an oath, as we took an oath in this Chamber collectively, just as the newest Member, the gentleman from Illinois did today, taking an oath to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States, it is more than lip service.

Mr. Speaker, good people may disagree and we champion those disagreements and we want to have open, honest debate on different priorities, but I think the gentleman from Kansas really hit the nail on the head when he discussed the Jeffersonian ideal, the ideal of the one whom our friends on the other side of the aisle claim as their ideological benefactor, one of their Founders.

□ 1615

When Jefferson called for limited and effective government, that is the distinction, not that Government should be reduced beyond recognition so that the people are not empowered, that Government has a rightful role in society, but it is a limited and effective Federal Government which makes the difference and to which the gentleman from Kansas has devoted his energies, indeed as part of this new majority. I thank him for all the efforts he has made in so many different ways to realize that dream for our children, for our parents, for our grandparents, and, indeed, for the American Nation.

Again, it is worth noting and we again issue the challenge. To those who disagree with us, Mr. Speaker, to those who offer the endless mantra of disinformation about so-called Draconian cuts with reference to the Medicare Plus Program, again, Mr. Speaker, we ask them, show us the mathematical operation that takes an increase from \$4,800 of spending per Medicare beneficiary this year and over 6 years time increases it to \$7,100 per beneficiary, show us where that is a cut, and \$1 million will be paid to them.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would not this. I cited Benjamin Franklin earlier. Will Rogers offered an update in the mid-20th century before his untimely death: "The only thing certain is death and taxes, but death does not get worse every time Congress meets."

THE NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I would like to again call attention to the fact that as of 3 o'clock this afternoon, the Nation's Federal debt, official debt, is \$4,988,313,115,981.39. Very interesting, this is again an additional decrease of \$126 million, actually almost \$127 million.

As a new Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that I did not come here with all of the answers, and very frankly I am not sure I even understood all of the problems. But one of the problems that I want to bring to my colleagues' attention today is that a member of the Committee on the Budget asked me earlier in the week whether this number was accurate. Under his recollection, the national debt limit was actually \$4.9 trillion. As we can see, the number before us today is \$4.988 trillion plus \$300 million, or literally \$4 trillion, \$988 billion, \$88 billion more than the official national debt.

Frankly, that caused me to go back to my office staff and question whether we had appropriately researched the number. Well, lo and behold, we have researched the number, and this is the correct number because, in addition to the \$4.9 trillion of Federal debt, we have authorized another \$88 billion of debt that does not count against the limit.

As if that were not enough, earlier in the week, Mr. Speaker, I addressed this Chamber on the basis of a New York Times article from Wednesday, December 6, 1995, wherein it indicated that the administration, since November 15 of this year, has actually borrowed another \$61.3 billion on top of the \$88 billion that does not count as part of the national debt. In addition to the \$4.9 trillion that is the national debt, the administration borrowed that \$61 billion from the Federal Civil Service retirement accounts and that apparently that was permissible under law. I hope that in the earlier vote in the afternoon that we are able to pass a measure that will preclude that.

The point I want to make today is that, the more I as a new Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, learn about the nature and the extent of the problems with Federal spending, the more alarmed I become. Literally, just in the last 3 days I have found \$88 billion of debt that we were not counting against the national debt. That is on top again of another \$60 billion that has been borrowed out of Civil Service retirement accounts. That is over \$150 billion. We were not even counting it. We are not even counting it. This is over and above the congressionally authorized limit of \$4.9 trillion.

I have to mention this afternoon that another bit of information came to my